

2000 Current Fiscal Year Report: Pilot Program Evaluation Panel

Report Run Date: 06/06/2019 03:35:34 AM

1. Department or Agency

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

2. Fiscal Year

2000

3. Committee or Subcommittee

Pilot Program Evaluation Panel

3b. GSA Committee No.

5287

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

No

5. Current Charter

06/30/1999

6. Expected Renewal Date

7. Expected Term Date

8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?

Yes

8b. Specific Termination Authority

42 U.S.C. 2201

8c. Actual Term Date

03/31/2000

9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year

Terminate

10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

No

10b. Legislation Pending?

11. Establishment Authority

Agency Authority

12. Specific Establishment Authority

42 U.S.C. 2201

13. Effective Date

01/19/1975

14. Committee Type

Ad hoc

14c. Presidential?

No

15. Description of Committee

Scientific Technical Program Advisory Board

16a. Total Number of Reports

1

16b. Report Date

12/17/1999

Report Title

Final Report of The Pilot Program Evaluation Panel

Number of Committee Reports Listed: 1

17a. Open 3 17b. Closed 0 17c. Partially Closed 0 Other Activities 0 17d. Total 3

Meetings and Dates

Purpose	Start	End
Review of Performance Indicators and Risk Informed Baseline Inspections	11/16/1999	11/17/1999
Develop Consensus On Panel's Final Report	12/08/1999	12/09/1999
Identify any Additional Issues for Consideration Following Issuance of Final Report in December 1999	01/14/2000	01/14/2000

Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 3

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$80,000.00	\$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$3,779.00	\$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00

18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18d. Total	\$83,779.00	\$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.70	0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

The NRC developed a revised regulatory oversight process for commercial nuclear power plants. A new risk-informed inspection process, industry performance indicators, a new streamlined assessment process, and a new enforcement policy form the basis of the revised oversight program. The revised oversight program is expected to; (1) improve the objectivity of the oversight so subjective decisions and judgments are not central features; (2) improve the transparency of the oversight so NRC actions have a clear tie to licensee performance; and (3) risk-inform the oversight process to focus NRC and licensee resources on performance having the greatest impact on plant safety. The Commission instituted a pilot program that was tested at two sites per each region. To evaluate whether the NRC can effectively carry out the new oversight program, the NRC established the Pilot Program Evaluation Panel (PPEP) as an independent advisory committee. The NRC chartered the PPEP to evaluate the pilot program results against the staff evaluation criteria. For those criteria that measure the effectiveness of the oversight, but do not have quantifiable performance measures, the PPEP depended on its member's expertise to review the results of the pilot effort and evaluate how well the pilot effort meets underlying objectives. The PPEP worked as a management level cross-disciplinary oversight group of experts to evaluate whether the new regulatory oversight can be successfully and effectively carried out and how the pilot program compares in its execution to its overall objectives. The PPEP met periodically during the implementation of the pilot program to review the pilot results and program status. All meetings were publicly announced and open to the public. All meeting material was made available to public. The results of the PPEP evaluations were summarized in December 17, 1999 final report, which provided the consensus views of the members. Where minority views remained, the report documented them. The conclusions and recommendations documented by the panel highlighted issues for the NRC staff to consider. Overall, the panel concluded that the revised oversight processes: framework provides a more objective, scrutable, and risk-informed approach to the oversight of nuclear reactors. The program should proceed to industry-wide implementation. The panel has identified several areas that need refinement before industry-wide implementation. In addition, industry-wide implementation will be needed to gather data to judge the effectiveness of the program and to allow for further improvements. The Panel discussed its final report with the staff during the Staff's workshop of January 14, 2000. The Panel was terminated following the January 14, 2000 meeting.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

The PPEP is balanced by including participants from NRC headquarters and regional management, a representative from the Nuclear Energy Institute, pilot plant licensee management representatives, a representative from the Union Of Concerned Scientists, and a representative from the Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

Five meetings were held between July 1999 and January ,2000 (3 in FY 2000). A Final Report of the Committee was issued in December 2000. A final meeting was held in Jan 2000 and it was determined that no new issues had arisen following the Dec Report.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

The cross section of representatives from NRC, Licensee, and Public Interest Groups provides an excellent overview for the NRC revisions to its regulatory process.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

Not applicable.

21. Remarks

Committee held final meeting on Jan 14, 2000.

Designated Federal Officer

Mohan Thadani

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
Bajestani, Masoud	07/01/1999	01/31/2000	Tennessee Valley Authority	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Barnes, George	07/01/1999	01/31/2000	Commonwealth Edison Company	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Brockman, Kenneth	07/01/1999	01/31/2000	US NRC	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Chase, James	07/01/1999	01/31/2000	Omaha Public Power District	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Floyd, Steve	07/01/1999	01/31/2000	Nuclear Energy Institute	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Gaarchow, David	07/01/1999	09/30/2000	Public Service Electric and Gas	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Gillespie, Frank	07/01/1999	01/31/2000	US NRC	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Grant, Geoffrey	07/01/1999	01/31/2000	US NRC	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Hahn, Heidi	07/01/1999	01/31/2000	Los Alamos National Laboratory	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Lieberman, James	07/01/1999	01/31/2000	USNRC	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member

Lochbaum, David	07/01/1999	01/31/2000	Union Of Concerned Scientists	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Mallet, Bruce	07/01/1999	01/31/2000	US NRC	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Thadani, Mohan	07/01/1999	01/31/2000	US NRC	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Wiggins, James	07/01/1999	01/31/2000	US NRC	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Wright, Gary	07/01/1999	01/31/2000	Illinois Department Of Nuclear Safety	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 15

Narrative Description

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

Improvements to health or safety	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trust in government	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major policy changes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advance in scientific research	<input type="checkbox"/>
Effective grant making	<input type="checkbox"/>
Improved service delivery	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increased customer satisfaction	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Outcome Comments

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Unable to Determine	<input type="checkbox"/>
Under \$100,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$100,000 - \$500,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Over \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost Savings Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Cost Savings Comments

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

0

Number of Recommendations Comments

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable ☒

Agency Feedback Comments

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities

☐

Reallocated resources

☐

Issued new regulation

☐

Proposed legislation

☐

Approved grants or other payments

☐

Other

☐

Action Comments

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

No

Grant Review Comments

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

Contact DFO

☐

Online Agency Web Site

☐

Online Committee Web Site

☐

Online GSA FACA Web Site

☐

Publications

☐

Other

☐

Access Comments